

retains the privilege of bilateral agreements with member nations just as member nations of ESRO retain the privilege of conducting their own national programs.

NASA expects this regional cooperative approach to grow—possibly in South America next—and expects greater participation from member nations of the U.N. space committee.

Joint satellite launching agreements so far have been completed only with the United Kingdom and Canada—chiefly because cost and competence are formidable barriers. But the appearance of the large observational satellites, which can carry a number of experiments, may permit other countries to send up single experiments. They would be subject to the same selection process used to select experiments by NASA, university and industry experimenters now.

Participation in NASA's space work has included Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland. All three have made correlated ground observations of Tiros weather satellites at the invitation of NASA and the Weather Bureau.

"Some time ago there was a rash of propaganda that Tiros was a spy satellite," one NASA official said. "The value of the openness of the program is that everyone recognizes its benefits and sees from what it does that it is not a spy satellite. Had we been secretive, they would still be calling it a spy, but foreigners have actually sat here and seen the readouts."

SOVIET SITUATION

Recent talks in Geneva between Soviet Academician A. A. Blagonravov and NASA's Deputy Administrator, Dr. Hugh Dryden, produced some hope that Russia may eventually cooperate in space research.

A joint communique issued by Dryden and Blagonravov said that recommendations had been forwarded to both governments for cooperation in meteorology, a world magnetic survey and satellite telecommunications, looking toward eventual coordinated launchings of meteorological satellites and probable coordinated launchings of satellites by each country for the magnetic project.

Frutkin pointed out in a speech some time ago that the International Geophysical Year, often cited as an example of worldwide scientific cooperation, was in fact a collection of national programs loosely coordinated by a nongovernmental mechanism; that it did not solve any political problems; that Soviet intransigence greatly restricted the ICY agreements for exchange of information in space research, and that Russia has effectively blocked a purely scientific symposium on space research under U.N. auspices in order to exact a political price which would give it a veto over the activities of other nations in meeting the problems of outer space.

But the Geneva talks—followups to exchanges of views by President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev—have at least raised the possibility that Russia has learned a lesson. If it has, some NASA officials are certain that the U.S. international program was the teacher.

Washington Can't Solve This

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson, Mich., Citizen Patriot of October 9, 1962:

WASHINGTON CAN'T SOLVE THIS

If nothing else, President Kennedy's recent whirlwind stomp through Michigan demonstrated that the Chief of State still enjoys considerable personal popularity in this State, despite developments in Cuba and Berlin and his inability to whip his Democratic Congress into line.

Good-sized crowds turned out all along the way to cheer the President, and his pleas to register and to vote for progress.

However, the President didn't take leave of Washington and the crises facing the Nation merely to enhance his image. Far more urgent matters beckon Mr. Kennedy's attention.

He and fellow Democrats are more concerned because soundings taken by their own pollsters tell them their party is in big trouble in Michigan, and several other Midwest States, where Democrats have gained influence during the last several years.

President Kennedy and lesser figures are well aware that the only possible way of stemming the tide before election time is to send in the first team.

This they are doing, as the President's acknowledged political tour dramatized.

With full weight on the panic button, Michigan Democrats already have flown in three Cabinet members, the Peace Corps Director, and the President. Not only have they made one trip to Michigan to rescue Gov. John B. Swainson and associates from George Romney and the Republicans, they have promised to return for another round. And during the coming weeks, Harry S. Truman will come to Michigan with similar motives.

All in all, the Democrats are obviously shaken by what they see as a possibility on November 6—the end of a 14-year rule of the State executive branch by the Democrats and labor unions.

The Democrats cannot be blamed for rushing in their best troops in time of crisis.

But Mr. Romney is precisely correct when he states that the issue in Michigan is leadership; leadership that Michigan Democrats have failed to produce.

No amount of campaigning by the President, ex-President Truman or others on the rescue mission squad from Washington is going to solve this basic problem in Michigan.

J.F.K. Soft on Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include herewith, from the Joplin Globe of Tuesday, October 9, 1962, a news—partial—report of my statements by remote control to my constituents at a rally at Redings Mill, Newton County, Mo., on Monday, October 8. Ordinarily, I do not insert such reports or remarks in the Record but this is apropos my action this date in introducing a bill before this Congress amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, which will become known as the Russian Organization Control Act of 1963. The news report follows:

HALL CLAIMS J.F.K. SOFT ON REDS

Representative DURWARD HALL charged Monday night that the New Frontier has failed to enforce the laws against Communists with the same vigor it used to enforce the law in Mississippi.

Speaking over a telephone hookup from his Washington office to a Republican rally in Redings Mill, Dr. HALL said the Justice Department has shown "more than 9 months of foot-dragging in the issue of the American Communist Party and its members, who have brazenly flouted the law and who have not been brought to justice."

Of the more than 10,000 Communists in this country, not one has registered as required by U.S. laws, HALL said. The deadline for Communists to register was last December 20, and penalties for failure to register included fines and prison terms.

"There is no indication when, if ever, any of the Communists will be brought to trial," Dr. HALL said.

HALL told party workers at the rally that he believes Democrats are trying to keep Congress in session while "the President is campaigning all over the country at taxpayers' expense for more Democrats."

Dr. HALL, who accused his opponent (Jim Thomas of Joplin), of twisting his voting record, said "I have a record I am proud to run on."

"Unlike my opponent," HALL said, "I am not in favor of wasting your tax dollars in foreign ratholes."

Further Deterioration in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that the American people are shocked, dismayed, and disgusted by President Kennedy's lack of firmness in Cuba.

He is now considering paying ransom with the taxpayers' money. Is this to be part of his foreign policy for the future? Robert G. Spivack in last Sunday's edition of the New York Herald Tribune and Fulton Lewis, Jr., in the October 9 issue of the New York Mirror further enlightened us on what is actually happening:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 7, 1962]

QUESTIONS ON CUBA

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—Clare Boothe Luce has accused the President of showing a profile in indecision in dealing with Soviet-occupied Cuba. Other critics have used equally strong language. For his part the President, anticipating the political storm that is brewing, has denounced cheap talk and rash action advocated by those who do not share the burdens of his office.

All this excited comment reflects great anxiety throughout the country and also within the Government.

There is ample reason for this anxiety. The fact is that we and our neighbors in Latin America suffered a small-scale Pearl Harbor during July and August. We are only now being told its full dimensions. The difference between summer 1962, and De-

ember 1941, is that the Soviet Union has taken Cuba without firing a shot.

According to the testimony of Under Secretary of State George Ball, there were 85 ships in the armada which carried Soviet men and material to Cuba. Their air missiles are of a 20- to 25-mile range. They are building three or four missile sites. They have sent 80 older type Mig jet fighters, at least one advanced type jet fighter, with probably another 25 or 30 on the way. Mr. Ball reports the presence of 4,500 Soviet military "technicians"; other informed sources use a higher figure, counting all eastern bloc "technicians."

There are many unanswered questions that are causing public anxiety about Cuba. Perhaps uppermost in people's minds is, "How did they sneak in?"

Until the administration tells us just what happened, the President is going to find it difficult to win support for whatever policies toward Cuba he develops because there will always be lingering doubts as to whether we are being told the whole truth.

For example:

Did the Central Intelligence Agency, under its new Director, John McCone, know of this armada of Soviet supplies and men? If the CIA did know, when were the facts reported to those White House officials whose job it is to oversee national security?

Assuming that the facts were known by the proper authorities, another question arises: Why was there no public warning to the Soviet Union that we would consider the presence in Cuba of Soviet troops and technicians to be an unfriendly act?

The argument is put forth that the Russians might have become angry and started shooting. The fact is that they have always backed down in the face of determined resistance, even in Europe. Is it reasonable to believe they would have done otherwise thousands of miles from the main body of their land-based troops?

This very same argument was offered as an excuse for permitting the wall to go up in Berlin. Mr. Khrushchev gambled that in Berlin and in Cuba we were "too liberal to fight." Apparently he was not worried that we might become angry.

Another point raised in the State Department goes like this: If we object to a Soviet base in Cuba, they might make trouble about our bases in Turkey or Great Britain or other countries. To this, two answers suggest themselves.

First, they have for years been making trouble about our overseas bases. Who inspired the "Yankee go home" demonstrations? Second, and far more important, the people in these nations know that we have not used our military bases for purposes of suppression.

Our soldiers did not put down the rebellion in Turkey. We have not prevented free elections anywhere. Equating American overseas behavior with Soviet overseas operations is thesis that our aims are imperialist.

No administration enjoys the embarrassment that inevitably follows Khrushchev's provocative demonstrations. Mr. Kennedy does not like it any more than General Eisenhower appreciated K's withdrawal of the invitation to visit the Soviet Union. We can expect Republicans to try to make as much political hay out of Mr. Kennedy's embarrassment as Candidate Kennedy did in 1960.

But the American electorate may be growing weary of demagoguery about Cuba from politicians in both parties. What does worry us is the presence of the Red Army. Until the Soviet Union withdraws its men, there will be little peace in the Western Hemisphere and not much here at home. Meanwhile Cuba remains a vast concentration camp just 90 miles off our shores.

[From the New York Mirror, Oct. 9, 1962]

**CAPITOL REPORT—ROSY RED PRAISE FOR
SOFT-ON-CUBA CROWD
(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)**

WASHINGTON, October 8.—Kremlin leaders have a few words of commendation for "sober-minded Americans" who "protest emphatically the hotheads of Washington."

The powerful voice of Radio Moscow on September 25 praised the activities of U.S. students who oppose any move against Fidel Castro's "Island of freedom."

The Moscow broadcast singled out something called the American Union of Students in Defense of Peace. It said that "the students picketed the White House September 23 in protest against anti-Cuban provocations. The students called for a policy of peace and friendship with Cuba."

A check by this office with Government security agencies disclosed that the American Union of Students in Defense of Peace is another name for the Student Peace Union, a nationwide leftwing pacifist group.

The group is not Communist controlled. Leftist students at 160 colleges and universities, however, are said to support the group, which calls for immediate disarmament. The group is dedicated to the proposition that war under any circumstances is unthinkable.

Radio Moscow cited a recent article in the Nation magazine by Samuel Shapiro, a University of Michigan history professor. He attacked any invasion of Cuba as costly and dangerous to the cause of world peace.

Shapiro is quoted by Radio Moscow as saying: "I think that in its policy in respect to Latin American countries, as well as in the other parts of the world, Republicans and Democrats apparently are defending not national interest but the property and profits of a handful of corporations."

The words of the disarmament buff, James P. Warburg, are also given wide circulation by Radio Moscow. It reports that the "well-known publicist attempted to pour cold water on the fevered brows of bellicose Senators in Washington." Warburg, says Radio Moscow, feels that any military action against Cuba would be a violation of the U.N. Charter and contrary to U.S. treaty obligations.

While certain Americans receive Kremlin kudos, others come under scorching attack. In that category are U.S. Senators DODD, KEATING, TOWER, and GOLDWATER. All have blasted the administration foreign policy as weak kneed.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a letter I received from Mr. G. M. Ellis, in which he expresses concern over the possibility of Federal control over education accompanying Federal aid. Mr. Ellis has made some very thought provoking comments which I am sure will be of interest to all.

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: After answering a questionnaire in the Palo Alto Times, the other day, which was forwarded to you by the requested method, I thought I would amplify

my personal objections to the Federal Government becoming involved in education.

In my opinion, I believe it dangerous, with the trends toward centralization, to allow power to become centralized, regardless of the purpose, except those that we classically believe a Federal Government should have and which are set forth in the Constitution. My firm belief is that education should never become in any way associated with indoctrination. I can't believe that Federal moneys would not have attached to their disbursement certain features of control and, in the future, if they were in the hands of men who are hungering for statist power, there is no reason to believe that they would not force their curriculum upon the schools. Further, if the Federal Government undertakes this program of financial "assistance", the local governments would then back off on the amounts they appropriate for schools and demand more and more of the Federal Government to take the place of the money spent elsewhere. This, in effect, means that we would enter the era of trading school buildings for some other Federal project. Again, I believe the facts are correct that more school buildings were built in the last 10 years than in any decade prior to this period. Where, then, is the dramatic, immediate need? Maybe the arguments creating the need are based on a "relativist" view of some recent Russian propaganda, which seems to be stimulating a lot of pronouncements of our shortcomings and need for action.

In spite of all the propaganda (domestic) being issued that this is a required program, the problem is far greater. The announced estimate, the other day, regarding 1 million children not graduating from high school, in this day and age of required technological or some other form of educational training, appears to me to be the paramount problem facing us today. Here again, we are thinking more about the material elements and quantities of a system, rather than the human element. Actually, the problem of school attendance, to complete high school to gain a usable education, can only be corrected on a local level. The problem involves individual people, it involves families, it involves the morale of schools and of teachers and, most certainly, it involves the selling of the idea of school to certain parents, who believe in this day and age that an educated person is to be suspected. Even locally, we find that there are many children who come from homes in which, I suspect, the idea of violence is still taught as the way to obtain the ends desired. At least, these children are not being influenced in the opposite direction. The number of children playing "hookey" from a local high school, with which I am familiar, are mostly amongst those who have little or no respect for "book larnin". Until this type of local thing is corrected it will be very difficult to convince these children, some of whom are highly intelligent, that they should remain in school and obtain a worthwhile education. I can't believe that moneys collected from individual people and sent to Washington and then returned to the local community can, in any way, solve this problem. In fact, if the wrong type of administrators of this program, who have the power of coercion granted by the Federal Government, are involved in the granting of the moneys to local communities, all sorts of side-effect problems would exist which, I believe, would further aggravate the current condition. To me, it would alleviate the local community of the responsibility and, therefore, these other problems, that I mentioned above, would unconsciously be classified as a subject for Federal corrective action.

The idea that some States are unable to afford the required classrooms, on a local level, is further indication that the Federal